UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/629,171 07/28/2003		Zhen-Da Hung	7171		
25859 WEI TE CHUN	7590 03/27/200 IG		EXAMINER		
FOXCONN IN	TERNATIONAL, INC		CAZAN, LIVIUS RADU		
1650 MEMOREX DRIVE SANTA CLARA, CA 95050			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3729		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/27/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/629,171	HUNG ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
LIVIUS R. CAZAN	3729	

	LIVIUS R. CAZAN	3729	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>29 February 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A		-	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extractional extraction extractional extractional extractional extractional extractional extraction extractional extractional extraction extraction extractional extraction extract	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	Called
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor			cause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	v);	,	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reig	acted claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	scied ciairris.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		(
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be alle		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	.		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>9 and 13</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10.	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/A. Dexter Tugbang/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 3729	

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 102(b) on claims 10-11 and 20, 102(e) on claims 1-4, 9-11, and 14-18; 103(a) on claims 12 and 19; 112 1st on claim 12; 112 2nd on claims 2-4, 12, and 15.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Since claim 20 was only rejected using the Howard reference while claim 9 was rejected using both Hwang and Howard, and claim 9 now recites the limitations previously found in claim 20, Applicant's arguments regarding claim 9 as rejected using Hwang will not be discussed, since that rejection has been overcome by this reply.

Regarding claim 9 as rejected using Howard, Applicant argues that if the pull tab 11 is not deemed a part of the connection portion, it cannot form the claimed loop configuration surrounding the cable retaining portion.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. See Fig. 7. The two plates 12 and 13 are linked by the connection portion as follows: starting with say plate 12, it is connected to the pull tab 11 by a connection portion, which is in turn connected to the plate 13 by another connection portion. Clearly, both connection portions are linked by the tab 11 between the two plates, this arrangement forming a loop configuration surrounding the cable retaining portion. As currently claimed, it is not required for the connection portion alone to form the loop configuration.

Regarding claim 13, Applicant argues in Hwang there is no hole such that the engaging portion and the fixing portion overlap each other and each defines a hole to form a passage for receiving and engaging with the mating portion of the electrical connector and that "the Examiner says nothing on it."

The examiner respectfully disagrees. See the Final Rejection, page 9, especially lines 4-7. The Examiner did address these limitations. For further clarification, Applicant's attention is drawn to the fact that claim 13 does not recite each of the engaging portion and fixing portion having a hole. Rather, the claim merely requires that the engaging portion and the fixing portion each defines a hole, which could be the same hole. Hole 704 is defined by the fixing portion 702 since the fixing portion defines the depth of the hole, and engaging portion 727 defines the hole since the neck 727 extending therefrom defines the minimum diameter of the hole/passage. This allows a mating portion of the electrical connector to be received and engaged. The current claim language does not set forth language that specifically requires the hole being the passage, and the passage receiving and engaging the connector, it merely has to somehow contribute to this taking place.